

THE HONORABLE ROBERT S. LASNIK

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE**

LENA ARMAS and ANDREA BLUM,  
individually and on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:22-cv-01726-RSL

v.

REALPAGE, INC., GREYSTAR REAL  
ESTATE PARTNERS, LLC, CH REAL  
ESTATE SERVICES, LLC, LINCOLN  
PROPERTY CO., FPI MANAGEMENT, INC.,  
MID-AMERICA APARTMENT  
COMMUNITIES, INC., AVENUE5  
RESIDENTIAL, LLC, EQUITY  
RESIDENTIAL, ESSEX MANAGEMENT  
CORPORATION, AVALONBAY  
COMMUNITIES, INC., CAMDEN PROPERTY  
TRUST, ESSEX PROPERTY TRUST, INC.,  
THRIVE COMMUNITIES MANAGEMENT,  
LLC, SECURITY PROPERTIES INC., B/T  
WASHINGTON, LLC d/b/a BLANTON  
TURNER, INDEPENDENCE REALTY  
TRUST, INC., CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD,  
INC., BH MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC,  
and UDR, INC.,

Defendants.

**STATUS REPORT**

Plaintiffs and Defendants<sup>1</sup> in the above-captioned action respectfully submit this status report pursuant to the Court's orders of December 27, 2022, December 29, 2022, and January 9, 2023, which directed the parties to meet and confer and file a status report. *See Armas v.*

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this status report, "Defendants" are only a subset of the defendants named in the various actions, and are limited to those that have signed this status report. Notably, despite their effort to consolidate, Plaintiffs have not served a single defendant in eight of the 13 cases they have filed.

1 *RealPage, Inc., et al.*, 2:22-cv-01726-RSL (W.D. Wash.), ECF Nos. 54, 56, 69. Pursuant to the  
2 Court's orders, Plaintiffs and Defendants met and conferred on January 13, 2023.

3  
4 **Plaintiffs' Position.** The Parties had previously filed stipulated motions in *Morgan* and  
5 *Armas* requesting that the Court suspend Defendants' deadlines to respond to the complaint,  
6 and instead file a status report on January 18, 2023.

7 Since then, Plaintiffs filed a motion on December 19, 2022 to consolidate the 11 related  
8 cases then pending in the Western District of Washington.<sup>2</sup> *Navarro v. RealPage, Inc., et al.*,  
9 No. 2:22-cv-01552-RSL (W.D. Wash.) ("*Navarro*") Dkt. 67. The Parties completed briefing on  
10 Plaintiffs' consolidation motion on January 13, 2023.

11 On December 19, 2022, Plaintiffs filed motions for appointment of leadership in the  
12 related cases. *Navarro* Dkt. 64; *Morgan, et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01712  
13 ("*Morgan*") Dkt. 52. On January 10, 2023, the Court entered a minute order in the *Navarro*  
14 case setting a case schedule that is tied to the Court's pending order on the motion to  
15 consolidate. *Navarro* Dkt. 77. On January 13, 2023, the Court appointed Hagens Berman Sobol  
16 Shapiro to serve as interim class counsel on behalf of the proposed nationwide class of student  
17 renters. *Navarro* Dkt. 78. Plaintiffs' motion for appointment of leadership for the proposed  
18 nationwide class of multifamily renters is fully briefed and pending. *Morgan* Dkt. 52, 85, 127.

19 Defendants filed a second petition with the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation  
20 ("JPML") on January 4, 2023, to transfer all related cases to the Northern District of Texas,  
21 where no case was filed. Responses to Defendants' petition are due on January 31, 2023. All  
22 Plaintiffs that joined the consolidation motion will file a response to Defendants' petition, and  
23 will ask the JPML to transfer all related cases to the Western District of Washington. The next

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> As noted in Plaintiffs' reply in support of consolidation, since the original motion, five additional plaintiffs have  
26 filed separate complaints in the Western District of Washington, four of whom support consolidation. *Boelens v.*  
27 *RealPage, Inc., et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01802 ("*Boelens*"); *Moore v. The Irvine Company, LLC, et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-  
01826 ("*Moore*"); *Yusupov v. RealPage, Inc., et al.*, No. 2:23-cv-00013 ("*Yusupov*"); *Crook v. RealPage, Inc., et*  
*al.*, No. 2:23-cv-00054 ("*Crook*"); *Hardie et al v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:23-cv-00059 ("*Hardie*"). Plaintiff  
Boelens opposes consolidation as premature—primarily on the basis that there are cases pending in other districts  
that would not be subject to the consolidation motion and thus consolidation would be partial.

1 JPML hearing at which the JPML petition may be heard is set for March 30, 2023.

2 The pending consolidation and leadership motions are ripe for resolution by the Court.  
3 Furthermore, developments since the filing of the leadership and consolidation motions  
4 illustrate that it would significantly aid the parties, the Court, and the JPML if the Court would  
5 grant the pending consolidation motion and appoint interim class counsel for the multifamily  
6 class proposed in the leadership motion.

7 First, there are significant scheduling efficiencies for the parties and the Court in  
8 granting the consolidation motion in light of the progress of the related cases. Granting the  
9 consolidation motion would ensure that the student and multifamily housing matters proceed on  
10 the same schedule for briefing and discovery. In the event of consolidation, Plaintiffs anticipate  
11 that the parties will coordinate on matters such as initial discovery and motion to dismiss  
12 briefing if the two matters are set for the same schedule.

13 Second, a decision on the motion would benefit the JPML. One factor the JPML will  
14 consider in determining the most appropriate jurisdiction for centralization is whether cases  
15 have advanced in a particular jurisdiction. *See, e.g., In re Smith & Nephew BHR & R3 Hip*  
16 *Implant Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 249 F. Supp. 3d 1348, 1352 (U.S. Jud. Pan. Mult. Lit. 2017)  
17 (transferee district presiding over “one of the most procedurally-advanced actions”); *In re:*  
18 *AndroGel Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 24 F. Supp. 3d 1378, 1380 (U.S. Jud. Pan. Mult. Lit. 2014)  
19 (transferee court “has already taken initial steps to organize litigation”); *In re Pet Food Prod.*  
20 *Liab. Litig.*, 499 F. Supp. 2d 1346, 1347 (J.P.M.L. 2007) (“pretrial proceedings are advancing  
21 well” in transferee district); *In re Republic Nat’l-Realty Equities Sec. Litig.*, 382 F. Supp. 1403,  
22 1406 (J.P.M.L. 1974) (cases in transferee district “proceeding expeditiously”). While this Court  
23 has already advanced the cases significantly, granting the pending consolidation and leadership  
24 motions would allow Plaintiffs and Defendants to move the matters in this District forward  
25 with efficiency and coordination. If and when the JPML decides to transfer the other cases to  
26 this District, those cases and plaintiffs would be folded in to the consolidated action without  
27 disrupting or delaying efficient and coordinated progress of this litigation. Even if the JPML

1 transfers the cases to a different jurisdiction, the related actions pending in this District would  
2 be remanded back to this District for trial, following pretrial proceedings in the transferee court.

3 Third, if the Court grants the consolidation motion, the Plaintiffs in the consolidated  
4 cases would likely be able to file a single, consolidated complaint for the multifamily case  
5 before the JPML panel hears the pending motion to transfer on March 30, 2023. It would be  
6 beneficial for the JPML to review the scope and detail of an amended consolidated complaint,  
7 as it would further inform in which jurisdiction pretrial proceedings should occur.

8 Fourth, there are numerous, ongoing procedural and substantive issues that Plaintiffs  
9 anticipate the parties having to navigate over the next several months before the JPML will  
10 have a chance to address Defendants' petition. These include matters such as the issuance of  
11 evidence preservation letters, the potential commencement of certain discovery tasks, including  
12 negotiating standing protective orders for confidential documents, negotiating protocols for the  
13 production of electronically stored information, and serving requests for production and  
14 negotiating the scope of document productions, and commencing initial discovery negotiations  
15 with the defendant in the *Armas* complaint that filed an answer to the Plaintiffs' complaint.  
16 Plaintiffs think that appointment of leadership would be greatly beneficial in ensuring that these  
17 tasks are promptly performed on behalf of a nationwide class of Plaintiffs. Furthermore, those  
18 tasks must be done regardless of where the cases may ultimately go, and so there is no reason  
19 to delay. It would be inefficient for the parties to defer those tasks until the JPML hears  
20 Defendants' petition at the end of March, and potentially prejudicial to Plaintiffs' claims, in the  
21 event that relevant evidence is lost or destroyed because preservation efforts were delayed.  
22 Further, regardless of preservation efforts, witness memories are lost or fade with the passage  
23 of time. Unnecessary delay is prejudicial.

24 Fifth, counsel for other plaintiffs have now had multiple opportunities to be heard on  
25 the pending motions. Indeed, the same counsel for certain plaintiff cases pending in other  
26 jurisdictions that had previously filed a response to the leadership motion have now filed a  
27 motion to intervene in order to oppose leadership and consolidation, *Navarro* Dkt. 80. Plaintiffs

1 will respond expeditiously to that motion. The motion to intervene merely repeats the same  
2 meritless arguments the same counsel made in their prior response to the leadership and  
3 consolidation motions. As the Court previously recognized, the motions for consolidation and  
4 leadership are “currently before the Court” through motions that followed the briefing  
5 schedules set by the local rules. *Navarro*, Dkt. 78. The exact same set of counsel were on notice  
6 of the motion—and indeed filed a response—but chose not to oppose the motions at that time.<sup>3</sup>  
7 On this second go-around, these counsel *still* make no substantive arguments on leadership in  
8 their motion.<sup>4</sup> They propose no alternative leadership structure of their own, provide no  
9 evidence of their own qualifications, and make no attempt to dispute any of the substantive  
10 arguments that Plaintiffs have set forth in support of their proposed leadership structure.  
11 Plaintiffs have filed a leadership motion and litigated it on the merits. Counsel for other sets of  
12 plaintiffs have now had multiple chances to state their position, but declined to do so. The  
13 leadership and consolidation motions remain before the Court and are ripe for resolution.

14 Therefore, Plaintiffs respectfully submit that the Court should grant the pending  
15 consolidation motion and appoint leadership for the nationwide class of multifamily renters, so  
16 that the cases may proceed efficiently on the same schedule. *Navarro*, Dkt. 77.

17  
18 **Defendants’ Position.** The above-captioned action is one of 28 related actions  
19 (collectively, the “Related Actions”), including 16 pending in this District and 12 actions pending  
20 in other districts, including the Western District of Texas, the District of Massachusetts, the  
21 District of Colorado, the District of Columbia, the Middle District of Tennessee, the District of  
22

23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>3</sup> The exact same set of four law firms signed both the response to the leadership motion and the motion to  
intervene. *See Navarro* Dkt. 70, 80.

27 <sup>4</sup> The motion to intervene also largely mirrors Defendants’ arguments against consolidation, and has already been  
addressed by Plaintiffs’ reply in support of consolidation. *Navarro* Dkt. 79.

1 Arizona, and the Southern District of Florida.<sup>5</sup> Although several Related Actions, including the  
 2 above-captioned action, were initially filed outside the Western District of Washington before  
 3 being voluntarily dismissed and refiled in this District, it is apparent that most of the 12 Related  
 4 Actions pending outside the Western District of Washington will not be voluntarily dismissed  
 5 and refiled in this District. As Plaintiffs admitted, counsel in those 12 Related Actions have  
 6 “rejected efforts to coordinate” with Plaintiffs. *Morgan et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-  
 7 cv-01712 (W.D. Wash.), ECF No. 127 at 4. Accordingly, on January 4, 2023, defendants named  
 8 in the Related Actions, including many Defendants, filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 before  
 9 the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (the “JPML”) to centralize the Related Actions  
 10 in the Northern District of Texas. *See In re: RealPage, Inc., Rental Software Antitrust Litig.*,  
 11 MDL No. 3071, ECF No. 1. Defendants believe that judicial and party efficiency is best served  
 12 by allowing the JPML to first determine the district in which all 28 Related Actions will be  
 13 consolidated before there is any further activity in the Related Actions. Counsel in the Related  
 14 Actions outside the Western District of Washington agree. *See Boelens v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*,  
 15 No. 2:22-cv-01802 (W.D. Wash.), ECF No. 30 at 2 (“[T]he Judicial Panel on Multidistrict  
 16 Litigation is best suited to determine the appropriate transferee venue,” which “will be best  
 17 placed to determine how best to account for the significant regional issues at play across the

---

18 <sup>5</sup> The 28 Related Actions are: (1) *Navarro v. RealPage, Inc., et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01552-RSL (W.D. Wash.); (2)  
 19 *Alvarez et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01617-RSL (W.D. Wash.); (3) *Cherry et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et*  
 20 *al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01618 (W.D. Wash.); (4) *Morgan et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01712 (W.D. Wash.);  
 21 (5) *Armas et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01726 (W.D. Wash.); (6) *Johnson v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No.  
 22 2:22-cv-01734 (W.D. Wash.); (7) *Silverman et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01740 (W.D. Wash.); (8)  
 23 *Bohn et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01743 (W.D. Wash.); (9) *Pham et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No.  
 24 2:22-cv-01744 (W.D. Wash.); (10) *Weaver v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-03224 (D. Colo.); (11) *Godfrey v.*  
 25 *RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01759 (W.D. Wash.); (12) *Zhovmiruk v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01779  
 26 (W.D. Wash.); (13) *White v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-12134 (D. Mass.); (14) *Vincin et al. v. RealPage,*  
 27 *Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-01329 (W.D. Tex.); (15) *Carter v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-1332 (W.D. Tex.); (16)  
*Boelens v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01802 (W.D. Wash.); (17) *Moore v. The Irvine Company, LLC et al.*,  
 No. 2:22-cv-01826 (W.D. Wash.); (18) *Kramer v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-03835 (D.D.C.); (19) *Precht v.*  
*RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-12230 (D. Mass.); (20) *Watters v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 3:22-cv-01082 (M.D.  
 Tenn.); (21) *Mackie v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-00011 (D. Colo.); (22) *Yusupov v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*,  
 No. 2:23-cv-00013 (W.D. Wash.); (23) *Bertlshofer v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:23-cv-00018 (D. Ariz.); (24)  
*Enders v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-00055 (D. Colo.); (25) *Hardie et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:23-  
 cv-00059 (W.D. Wash.); (26) *Crook v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:23-cv-00054 (W.D. Wash.); (27) *Parker et al. v.*  
*RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-20160 (S.D. Fla.); and (28) *Corradino et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-  
 20165 (S.D. Fla.).

1 different related cases.”). For its part, the JPML set a briefing schedule that calls for the motion  
2 to be fully briefed by February 7, 2023. *See In re: RealPage, Inc., Rental Software Antitrust*  
3 *Litig.*, MDL No. 3071, ECF No. 4.

4 Consolidating 11 Related Actions when the JPML will determine in the near future  
5 whether and where all 28 Related Actions should be consolidated would be inefficient and, at  
6 best, premature. It would be highly inefficient to proceed piecemeal in a subset of the Related  
7 Actions when the JPML will decide where all of them will proceed. Plaintiffs’ effort to  
8 consolidate 11 Related Actions is particularly inefficient given that Plaintiffs’ motion necessarily  
9 does not reach the many defendants who remain unserved; as noted, six of the 11 cases remain  
10 completely unserved. This is not a mere technicality because there are multiple defendants who  
11 have not been served in *any* of the cases that Plaintiffs seek to consolidate and, therefore, have  
12 no notice of these proceedings, let alone the consolidation motion. Given these procedural  
13 dynamics, Plaintiffs’ consolidation motion seeks to put the cart before the horse and is, at best,  
14 premature. This is particularly true because Plaintiffs are urging that, if consolidation occurs, the  
15 briefing and discovery schedule in *Navarro* should apply to all of the consolidated cases, even  
16 though a consolidated proceeding would involve many more plaintiffs and defendants, and a  
17 number of additional potential alleged geographic markets. Defendants respectfully refer the  
18 Court to their brief in opposition to Plaintiffs’ motion for why else Plaintiffs’ motion is  
19 premature. *See Navarro v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01552 (W.D. Wash.), ECF No. 76  
20 (Plaintiffs’ proposed consolidation will create inefficiencies that include the risk that the Court  
21 may need to unwind or revise its ruling on Plaintiffs’ consolidation motion depending on how  
22 the JPML rules on Defendants’ § 1407 motion); *see also Van Horn v. Korean Air Lines Co., Ltd.*,  
23 2007 WL 9775632, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 31, 2007) (Robart, J.) (striking motion to consolidate  
24 cases and granting motion to stay pending resolution of section 1407 motion where “cases were  
25 filed less than 90 days ago”); *Nue LLC v. Oregon Mutual Ins. Co.*, 2020 WL 7016052, at \*2  
26 (W.D. Wash. July 1, 2020) (Lasnik, J.) (holding that “principles of judicial economy weigh in  
27 favor of granting a stay” pending resolution of section 1407 motion); *Short v. Hyundai Motor*



1 *Am. Inc.*, 2019 WL 3067251, at \*3 (W.D. Wash. July 12, 2019) (Robart,J.) (staying case pending  
 2 resolution of section 1407 motion because “requiring parties to comply with their Rule 26(f) and  
 3 initial disclosures obligations before the JPML decision would be prejudicial” (internal quotation  
 4 mark omitted)).

5 Similarly, to the extent the Court entered a case schedule in *Navarro v. RealPage, Inc. et*  
 6 *al.*, 2:22-cv-01552 (W.D. Wash.), on the perception that *Navarro* is different because it concerns  
 7 a putative class of student housing lessees (versus all residential multifamily housing),  
 8 Defendants respectfully submit that pre-trial proceedings in *Navarro* will overlap with the other  
 9 27 Related Actions. As Plaintiffs themselves concede, “there will likely be legal questions and  
 10 certain factual issues that overlap between *Navarro* and the *Alvarez, Cherry, and Morgan*  
 11 *actions.*” *Navarro v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, 2:22-cv-01552 (W.D. Wash.), ECF No. 2 at 3. There  
 12 are accordingly judicial and party efficiencies gained from *Navarro* proceeding collectively with  
 13 the other Related Actions once the JPML makes its decision.

14 Plaintiffs make a number of efficiency-related arguments as though the Related Actions  
 15 in Washington are proceeding in a vacuum. As noted above, the many actions pending in other  
 16 jurisdictions would not be affected by the consolidation motion currently before the Court nor  
 17 would they be subject to any schedule or discovery obligations ordered by the Court. Defendants,  
 18 who must contend with these cases outside of the District, thus obtain no efficiency benefits  
 19 because they will remain subject to potentially differing obligations and schedules in these other  
 20 jurisdictions until the JPML rules. In fact, all of Plaintiffs’ efficiency arguments best apply to  
 21 ***all parties***—not just the Plaintiffs before the Court but also other plaintiffs and Defendants—if  
 22 the Court were to wait for the JPML to make its decision so there is a single schedule, a single  
 23 protective order, a single set of discovery obligations, etc.<sup>6</sup> Relatedly, Plaintiffs argue that it is  
 24 important for the multifamily cases to proceed on the same track as *Navarro* but there can be no  
 25 disputing that the most efficient way to ensure this result is to wait for the JPML’s

26 <sup>6</sup> Plaintiffs’ claim that document preservation issues will be more efficient if the Court grants their consolidation  
 27 motion does not follow—Defendants are aware of their preservation obligations, are complying with them, and  
 consolidation has no impact on them.



determination—any other course risks wasted time and resources.<sup>7</sup>

Plaintiffs also claim that the JPML would benefit from seeing a “consolidated complaint led by Plaintiff counsel who were the first to file the cases, and have done significant investigative work in developing the claims.” But the parties already have acknowledged that the complaints in the various Related Actions involve overlapping claims, factual allegations, and parties; in this context, Plaintiffs do not explain how the JPML would benefit from seeing a consolidated complaint derived from only a subset of the pleadings that ignores the specific allegations in nearly a dozen cases.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, there is nothing stopping Plaintiffs from submitting such a pleading or making whatever arguments they wish about their “investigative work” to the JPML. The Court does not need to grant Plaintiffs’ consolidation motion for them to do any of this.

In sum, Plaintiffs identify no reason why this Court should rush to rule now, instead of deferring until the JPML has time to do its work. By contrast, waiting until the JPML issues an order will generate significant efficiencies. Thus, Defendants respectfully request that the Court preserve the existing suspension of the deadline for Defendants to respond to the Complaint in all of the actions before it, and direct the parties to file a status report ten days after the JPML rules on the pending Section 1407 motion.

---

<sup>7</sup> Plaintiffs also note that one defendant—B/T Washington, LLC—filed an answer in one Related Action. *See Armas et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01726 (W.D. Wash.), ECF No. 65. B/T Washington, LLC, a local family-owned property manager, which was unaware of being a defendant in any other Related Action, filed its answer before it was aware that multiple Related Actions were pending in this and other districts, or that a consolidation motion had been filed with the JPML. B/T Washington, LLC agrees with Defendants that *Armas* and all other Related Actions should proceed on the same schedule, after the JPML rules. Indeed, it would make little sense—and be highly inefficient—for *Armas* to move forward for only one Defendant.

<sup>8</sup> Nor do Plaintiffs articulate how a consolidated complaint that covers only a subset of cases achieves any efficiencies when a new consolidated complaint will need to be drafted and filed when all of the cases are consolidated together. Again, Plaintiffs act as if theirs are the only cases with which Defendants must contend.

/s/ Steve W. Berman

Steve W. Berman (WSB No. 12536)  
steve@hbsslw.com  
Breanna Van Engelen (WSB No. 49213)  
breannav@hbsslw.com  
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292

/s/ Brittany S. Scott

Brittany S. Scott (*pro hac vice*)  
bscott@bursor.com  
BURSOR & FISHER PA  
1990 N. California Blvd., Suite 940  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: 925-300-4455

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Lena Armas and  
Andrea Blum Individually and on Behalf of  
All Others Similarly Situated*

/s/ Carl W. Hittinger

Carl W. Hittinger (*pro hac vice*)  
chittinger@bakerlaw.com  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
1735 Market Street, Suite 3300  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 564-2898

Curt Roy Hinline (WSBA No. 16317)  
chinline@bakerlaw.com  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
999 Third Avenue, Suite 3900  
Seattle, WA 98104-4040  
Telephone: (206) 332-1380

*Counsel for Defendant Equity Residential*

s/ Benjamin I. VandenBerghe

Benjamin I. VandenBerghe (WSBA No.  
35477)  
biv@montgomerypurdue.com  
Kaya R. Lurie (WSBA No. 51419)  
klurie@montgomerypurdue.com  
MONTGOMERY PURDUE PLLC  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5500

STATUS REPORT  
No. 2:22-cv-01726-RSL

/s/ Heidi Bradley

Heidi Bradley (WSBA No. 35759)  
hbradley@bradleybernsteinllp.com  
BRADLEY BERNSTEIN SANDS LLP  
113 Cherry Street, PMB 62056  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Telephone: (206) 337-6551

/s/ Jay Srinivasan

Jay Srinivasan (*pro hac vice*)  
jsrinivasan@gibsondunn.com  
Daniel G. Swanson (*pro hac vice*)  
dswanson@gibsondunn.com  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 229-7430

Stephen Weissman (*pro hac vice*)  
sweissman@gibsondunn.com  
Michael J. Perry (*pro hac vice*)  
mjperry@gibsondunn.com  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 955-8678

Ben A. Sherwood (*pro hac vice*)  
bsherwood@gibsondunn.com  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
Telephone: (212) 351-2671

*Counsel for Defendant RealPage, Inc.*

/s/ Lynn H. Murray

Lynn H. Murray (*pro hac vice*)  
lhmurray@shb.com  
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
111 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 4700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 704-7766

Ryan Sandrock (*pro hac vice*)  
rsandrock@shb.com  
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

Seattle, Washington 98104-7096  
*Counsel for Defendant Thrive Communities Management, LLC*

/s/ Maren R. Norton  
Maren R. Norton (WSBA No. 35435)  
maren.norton@stoel.com  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
600 University Street, Suite 3600  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: (206) 624-0900

Charles H. Samel (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
charles.samel@stoel.com  
Edward C. Duckers (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
ed.duckers@stoel.com  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
1 Montgomery Street, Suite 3230  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 617-8900

/s/ George A. Guthrie  
George A. Guthrie (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
gguthrie@wilkefleury.com  
WILKE FLEURY LLP  
621 Capitol Mall, Suite 900  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Telephone: (916) 441-2430

*Counsel for Defendant FPI Management, Inc.*

/s/ James Kress  
James Kress (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
james.kress@bakerbotts.com  
Paul Cuomo (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
paul.cuomo@bakerbotts.com  
BAKER BOTTS LLP  
700 K. Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 639-7884

Danny David (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
danny.david@bakerbotts.com

STATUS REPORT  
No. 2:22-cv-01726-RSL

555 Mission Street, Suite 2300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 544-1944

Laurie A. Novion (*pro hac vice*)  
lnovion@shb.com  
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
Telephone: (816) 559-2352

Hunter K. Ahern (WSBA No. 54489)  
hahern@shb.com  
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
701 5th Avenue, Suite 6800  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Telephone: (206) 344-7600

*Counsel for Defendant Camden Property Trust*

/s/ J. Dino Vasquez  
J. Dino Vasquez (WSBA No. 25533)  
dvasquez@karrtuttle.com  
KARR TUTTLE CAMPBELL  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300  
Seattle, WA 98104-7055  
Telephone: 206-224-8023

*Counsel for Defendant Security Properties Inc.*

BAKER BOTTS LLP  
 910 Louisiana Street  
 Houston, TX 77002  
 Telephone: (713) 229-4055

/s/ Rebecca S. Ashbaugh

Rebecca S. Ashbaugh (WSBA No. 38186)  
 bashbaugh@ashbaughbeal.com  
 ASHBAUGH BEAL LLP  
 701 5th Avenue, Suite 4400  
 Seattle, WA 98104  
 Telephone: (206) 386-5900

*Counsel for Defendant Avenue5 Residential,  
 LLC*

**National Counsel Participating in Meet  
 and Confer:**

/s/ Michael M. Maddigan

Michael M. Maddigan (*pro hac vice*  
 forthcoming)  
 michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com  
 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 785-4727

William L. Monts, III (*pro hac vice*  
 forthcoming)

william.monts@hoganlovells.com  
 Benjamin F. Holt (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 benjamin.holt@hoganlovells.com  
 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
 555 Thirteenth Street, NW  
 Washington, DC 20004  
 Telephone: (202) 637-6440

*Counsel for Defendant Greystar Real Estate  
 Partners, LLC*

/s/ Jeremy J. Calsyn

Jeremy J. Calsyn (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 jcalsyn@cgsh.com  
 Leah Brannon (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 lbrannon@cgsh.com  
 Kenneth Reinker (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 kreinker@cgsh.com  
 CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP  
 2112 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
 Washington, DC 20037  
 Telephone: (202) 974-1522

Joseph M. Kay (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 jkay@cgsh.com  
 CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP  
 One Liberty Plaza  
 New York, NY 10006  
 Telephone: (212) 225-2745

*Counsel for Defendant Cushman &  
 Wakefield, Inc.*

/s/ Gregory J. Casas

Gregory J. Casas (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
casasg@gtlaw.com  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
300 West 6th Street, Suite 2050  
Austin, TX 78701-4052  
Telephone: (512) 320-7200

Robert J. Herrington (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

herringtonr@gtlaw.com  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1840 Century Park East, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 586-7700

Becky L. Caruso (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
carusob@gtlaw.com

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
500 Campus Drive, Suite 400  
Florham Park, NJ 07932  
Telephone: (609) 442-1196

*Counsel for Defendant Lincoln Property Co.*

/s/ Stephen McIntyre

Stephen McIntyre (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
smcintyre@omm.com  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 430-8382

Ian Simmons (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

isimmons@omm.com  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
1625 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 29996  
Telephone: (202) 383-5106

*Counsel for Defendant BH Management Services, LLC*

/s/ Leo D. Caseria

Leo D. Caseria (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
lcaseria@sheppardmullin.com  
SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

/s/ Britt M. Miller

Britt M. Miller (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
bmiller@mayerbrown.com  
Daniel T. Fenske (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
dfenske@mayerbrown.com  
MAYER BROWN LLP  
71 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 6006  
Telephone: (312) 701-8663

*Counsel for Defendant Mid-America Apartment Communities, Inc.*

/s/ Belinda S Lee

Belinda S Lee (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
belinda.lee@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 395-8851

E. Marcellus Williamson (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

marc.williamson@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-2203

*Counsel for Defendant AvalonBay Communities, Inc.*

/s/ Barbara T. Sicalides

Barbara T. Sicalides (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
barbara.sicalides@troutman.com  
TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP  
3000 Two Logan Square  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 981-4783

Kasia Hebda (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

kasia.hebda@troutman.com  
TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Suite 3000  
Atlanta, GA 30308

2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 100  
Washington, DC, 20006  
Telephone: (202) 747-1925

Telephone: (404) 885-3665

*Counsel for Defendant Independence Realty  
Trust, Inc.*

*Counsel for Defendants Essex Management  
Corporation and Essex Property Trust, Inc.*

/s/ David D. Cross

David D. Cross (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

dcross@mofo.com

Jeffrey A. Jaeckel (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

jjaeckel@mofo.com

Robert W. Manoso (*pro hac vice*

forthcoming)

rmanoso@mofo.com

Sonja Swanbeck (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

sswanbeck@mofo.com

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

2100 L St, NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20037

Telephone: (202) 887-1500

*Counsel for Defendant UDR, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on January 18, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to those attorneys of record registered on the CM/ECF system.

DATED this 18<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2023.

/s/ Heidi B. Bradley

Heidi B. Bradley